

REMARKS

OVERVIEW

Claim 21 is pending in the present application. Claims 1-20 have been canceled. Claims 22-37 have been canceled. Claim 21 has been amended to clarify the interaction between the elements of the claim and to more clearly show the integration between the various components and to make clearer that the invention relates to the technical arts. The claim was not amended to narrow the scope of the claim.

RESPONSE TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the Examiner Interview.

The Applicants are in receipt of the Interview Summary prepared by the Examiner. The Applicants agree that the interview summary prepared by the Examiner is complete and accurate.

SPECIFICATION

The Abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because at lines 6 and 10, the word "invention" is used. Therefore, the Abstract has been amended to remove the reference to "invention". It is therefore respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

ISSUES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-14 and 19-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-14 and 19-20 have been canceled, thereby mooting these rejections. With respect to claim 21, it is noted that claim 21 now recites that the method is "computer-implemented" and requires the step of "presenting a computer generated output to the crop producer showing results from the integrated financial management services, the results including analysis of the ongoing break even points and profitability." The Applicants submit that the step of "presenting a computer generated output" makes clear the invention is within the technological arts and produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Support for the amendment is found in the original application, as filed, including at least in the illustrations of the computer generated output at Figures 5A through 7B.

In addition, the Examiner is directed towards the most recent U. S. Supreme Court authority on patent eligible subject matter, *J.E.M. Ag Supply, Inc. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc.*, 534 U.S. 124, 122 S.Ct. 593 (2001) noting that the language of § 101 is extremely broad. In addition, that same Court also recognized that § 101 is a dynamic provision designed to encompass new and unforeseen inventions. Therefore, the U.S. Supreme Court's most recent articulation of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 appears to provide for a broader view of patentable subject matter than that which the Examiner articulates. Therefore, to the extent the Examiner is articulating a more narrow standard, that standard is contrary to law.

ISSUES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 21 has been previously rejected for obviousness. The precise basis for the rejection made by a previously assigned Examiner is not clear as the previous rejection appears to be omnibus in nature without specifically applying prior art to the elements of the claim (Office Action, page 7, third full paragraph). It is hoped that by cancellation of the other claims, the Examiner will be able to focus on this single claim. It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art cited disclose or render obvious the invention of claim 21.

Please consider this a two-month extension of time and charge Deposit Account No. 26-0084 for the amount of \$210.00. No other fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 2 3 2003

OFFICIAL

Respectfully submitted,

MARK D. HANSING, Reg. No. 30,643 McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.

801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200 Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721 Phone No: (515) 288-3667

Fax No: (515) 288-1338 CUSTOMER NO: 22885

Attorneys of Record

- bja -